



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

seriously with this problem, nor touch on many of the points of contact between the synoptics and the fourth gospel.

The book is acute and painstaking, and contains much that is valuable. But the author does not survey the whole field covered by his problem, nor does he show good judgment in weighing evidence or in estimating its range of effect. The chief value of the treatise lies in the fact that it furnishes some new points of evidence in favor of the genuineness of the fourth gospel.

C. J. H. ROPES.

BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Bangor, Maine.

DER NEUENTDECKTE CODEX SYRUS SINAITICUS UNTERSUCHT; mit einem vollständigen Verzeichniss der Varianten des Cod. Sinaiticus und Cod. Curetonianus. Von DR. CARL HOLZHEY. München: Verlag der J. J. Lentner'schen Buchhandlung, 1896. Pp. vi + 59 + 89, 8vo. M. 5.

COLLATIO CODICIS LEWISIANI RESCRIPTI EVANGELIORUM SACRO-
RUM SYRIACORUM CUM CODICE CURETONIANO. (Mus. Brit.,
Add. 14,451.) Cui adiectæ sunt lectiones e Peshitto
desumptæ. Auctore ALBERTO BONUS, A.M. Oxonii: e
prelo Clarendoniano, 1896. Pp. xi + 97, 9 × 11½ in.
8s. 6d.

It will be convenient to notice these two books together, as their subject-matter is common. Each of them is occupied with a critical comparison of the text of the recently found Lewis Gospels of Mt. Sinai with the Cureton Gospels of the British Museum. Mr. Bonus' work in this direction is later in date than Dr. Holzhey's, though I cannot find any allusion in his book to the latter; and it supplements it in two important ways: (1) Mr. Bonus uses the more complete text of the Sinai Syriac Gospels which we owe to Mrs. Lewis' further investigations by which an astonishing addition (as well as very many corrections) had been made to the work of the first transcribers (see *Some pages of the Four Gospels retranscribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest* by A. S. Lewis; London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1896); (2) Mr. Bonus has added to his comparative tables of the parallel readings of the two famous old Syriac texts the corresponding readings of the Peshito. So that for the purposes of textual criticism Mr. Bonus' work puts that of Dr. Holzhey out of court. The former collation is now only useful to check the latter. Moreover, Dr. Holzhey was so sparing of his Syriac

type as to render it often impossible for a scholar to use his collation unless he had at hand the two texts from which the work was done. In this respect Mr. Bonus' work is much more convenient.

When we observe also that in some cases Mr. Bonus has occasionally corrected the slips in the printing of the Cureton text by an actual reference to the MS. in the British Museum, it will easily be seen that we have before us an important piece of careful critical work. Both of the writers in question refer to the supplementary fragments of the Cureton text which exist at Berlin.

It must not, however, be supposed that Bonus' publication entirely supplants that of Holzhey. In the prefatory matter of the former there is little that requires attention: its elegant Latinity disguises real critical poverty. Problems are stated with no hints for their solution, and the only thing one can gather is that it will be a long time before conclusions are arrived at, although as a matter of fact not a few of the questions involved are either solved already or well on the way to solution. But we suspect that Mr. Bonus rather inclines to that impossible Oxford school which is occupied with the task of maintaining the priority and extreme antiquity of the Peshito.

Holzhey's prolegomena occupy nearly sixty pages, and are a genuine contribution to the question; he sums up his conclusions under a number of heads, of which the most important are as follows: that the Lewis Gospel is a translation of a Greek text; that the Lewis and Cureton texts are recensions of the same primitive translation to which the Lewis text is nearer than the Cureton; the Peshito text is a reformed text formed from the same translation; the Lewis text is more free than the Cureton text from Western readings, while both texts show traces of what Dr. Hort calls Alexandrian readings. The text of the *Diatessaron* is held to be dependent from a text of the Lewis type. These are the chief critical conclusions as regards the text. They are most of them easily verified, except the last which is by no means a closed question.

It would be possible to find a few scattered errors in the two collations, but not many. In one passage of the Lewis text to which Mr. Bonus has properly attached a *sic*, Luke 17:13, a reference to the original MS. shows that the printed text is in error, and the supposed variant can be removed.

It should also be noticed that Mr. Bonus' quotations from the Peshito are not to be regarded as more than illustrations of the passages quoted from the two old Syriac texts; they are not intended to

be taken as a collation of the Peshito text with the MSS. in question. Some persons will wish that the work had been further extended in this direction; but we incline to think that Mr. Bonus has given us just what we wanted. To have attempted more would have made his work cumbrous and hard to use. As it is, the conspectus of readings is luminous and convenient.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

L'APÔTRE PAUL : ESQUISSE D'UNE HISTOIRE DE SA PENSÉE. Par A. SABATIER, Doyen de la Faculté de Théologie protestante de Paris. Troisième édition, revue et augmentée. Paris: Fischbacher, 1896. Pp. xxix + 424, 8vo. Fr. 6.

THIS important contribution to the study of Paulinism, which is intended to show the connection of the apostle's thought with his life, contains in its third edition considerable new matter, the most valuable of which is an appendix of fifty pages on Paul's doctrine of the origin of sin. The writer accepts all the epistles generally ascribed to Paul except the pastoral epistles. These, he thinks, were composed by some disciples of the apostle on the basis of brief letters of his. Paulinism appears in them to be impoverished rather than enriched. They have in part the doctrine of Paul without the soul.

According to M. Sabatier it should be the end of all history, and is the aim of all biblical criticism and exegesis, to find the original physiognomy of the sacred writers in the traditional type, the man in the prophet or the apostle. Of all the apostles, however, this "historical resurrection" is possible only in the case of Paul, because we have of him alone incontestable writings. He did not aim to construct a system of theology, but he was a missionary and preacher whose thought was influenced by his environment. He should not, then, be studied either from the point of view of those who regard him as a sort of speculative genius creating an *a priori* system, or of those who "stifle the personal travail of his mind under a crude and mechanical theory of inspiration." Perhaps, however, the course of development cannot, as the author supposes, be as accurately traced for want of data. The victory in the conference at Jerusalem may not have been the occasion of the apostle's belief in the inadequacy of the Mosaic law. May not the idea of grace through Christ as opposed to the law have lain in his mind at his conversion as one of the factors of that event? His "ardent conflicts" may have determined the form rather than the substance of the doctrine in Romans.